

### **REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended to its representative during the interview conducted on May 29, 2002. This response incorporates the matter discussed during the interview. Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 16-24 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 12, 14, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Weber et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,686,979). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, Claims 12, 14, and 15 are cancelled.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Ouderkirk, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,124,971. Claims 2, 3 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber and Ouderkirk as applied to claims and 1 and 12 above. Claims 4, and 7-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber and Ouderkirk as applied to claim 1 above. Claims 1 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber in view of Ouderkirk and further in view of Broer, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6, 359, 670. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Notwithstanding, claim 13 is canceled.

With respect to independent claim 1, and the remaining claims depending therefrom, please consider the following. Claim 1 calls for a light diffuser having a haze value H and a light reflector spaced apart from the light diffuser by a distance d. The distance d being between 0.2 and 0.7 millimeters. Further, the haze value of the light diffuser corresponds to the distance d by the following relationship:

$$H(\%) \geq -200d + 140(\text{mm})$$

In contrast, Weber teaches a distance between a diffuser and a reflector which is much greater than the claimed range. In this regard, it should also be appreciated that Weber discloses no particular haze value for its diffuser. Nonetheless, Weber fails to teach or suggest the claimed configuration including the specified distance between the diffuser and reflector as well as the relationship of the diffuser haze value to this distance. The remaining prior art references of record also fail to teach this aspect of the claimed invention.

### **NEW CLAIMS**


New claims 16-24 are added. The light reflector of claim 16 is not taught by the prior art of record. For example, the reflective polarizer of Ouderkirk is positioned at the front side of the light source 132. In contrast, the reflector of claim 16 is behind the illumination device. Also, Ouderkirk's reflective polarizer 148 does not correspond to the light reflector of claim 16. The dependent claims recite a reflection polarizing plate. This is element 40 in Applicant's specification. Reflection polarizing plate 40 may correspond to Ouderkirk's reflective polarizer 148. The claimed light reflector is therefore distinct from Ouderkirk's reflective polarizer 148.

### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 9, 2002

By:   
G. Gregory Schivley  
Reg. No. 27,382  
Bryant E. Wade  
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

## **ATTACHMENT FOR CLAIM AMENDMENTS**

The following is a marked up version of each amended claim in which underlines indicates insertions and brackets indicate deletions.

1. (Twice Amended) A display device comprising:  
a liquid crystal panel including a liquid crystal material;  
a light reflector provided behind the liquid crystal panel; and  
a light diffuser arranged between the liquid crystal material and the light reflector, the light diffuser having forward scattering characteristics, a space between the light diffuser and the light reflector being a certain distance;  
the light diffuser and the distance satisfying the following relationship:  
$$H(\%) \text{ [}>\text{]} \geq -200d + 140(\text{mm})$$
  
wherein d is the distance between the light diffuser and the light reflector,  
and H is a haze value of the light diffuser; and  
wherein  $0.7 \geq d \geq 0.2\text{mm}$ .